

### REMARKS

Applicants acknowledge with thanks the care taken in the examination of the application. This amendment is believed to meet all cited grounds of objection and to put the application in condition for allowance.

In respect of the examiner's comment on claim 68, the examiner's attention is drawn to claim 73 on which claim 68 is dependent.

Proposed drawing corrections accompany this response.

The claims have also been amended to clarify important differences in the teaching and structure between the present invention and the principal reference. Independent claims 102 and 112 and dependent claims 103-111 have been added.

The pending claims, prior to the current amendment, were rejected on the basis of Ingemann U.S. 5,007,231.

Ingemann is directed to providing a way to easily open a container. This is an entirely different motivating concept than that of the present invention, which provides a new means of display and transport of containers that typically must remain unopened while displayed.

Ingemann's "easily opened container" employs a pull ring arranged to rupture a weakened area at the rim of the container. In the specific form taught in Ingemann, a relatively rigid lever is moved by raising a pull ring that is part of the lever. Lifting the pull ring acts directly about a fulcrum to rupture the weakened region. Thus, Ingemann, at column 4, beginning line 8, describes: "...a stripping device 50 fitted with a pull ring 51.... [and] with a projecting portion 54....The stripping device consists of relatively rigid material....A fulcrum-effect will be created when the pull-ring is raised, which facilitates rupture along the weakened stripping line 22."

Ingemann's teaching of structure accomplishing easy opening is entirely different from the present teaching of novel, suspended containers for display and transport, which of course, in stores, typically must involve unopened containers. Ingemann has no teaching, nor does Ingemann fairly suggest, suspending containers by engagement about a rim of the container at its mouth, via a raised suspender, without disturbing the rim region of the container. Neither

Ingemann alone, nor in combination with any of the cited references, fairly suggests applicants' novel suspension system. The approach implicitly requires the relationship, now made explicit in the claims, as follows:

Claims 1, 28: "the...suspending element and the ring portion of the suspension device that is engageable with the rim of the container being so related that raising the suspending element relative to the ring portion and applying suspending force to the suspending element does not disturb the ring portion of the suspension device that is engageable with the rim of the container."

Claims 88, 95, 99 and 102: "the suspender and [rim-engaging] structure being so related that deflecting the suspender to suspending position and applying suspending force to the suspending element does not disturb the structure engageable with the rim of the container".

See also the last two phrases of claim 112.

Furthermore regarding, e.g., claims 12 and 29, Ingemann has no fair suggestion of forming a suspending element in a lower position, integrally with the rim-engaging ring portion of the suspension system. Ingemann's pull ring, it will be recalled, is part of a rigid structure intended to move independently of the rim region of the container to rupture the material at the rim of his container, to initiate the opening of the container.

For these reasons, it is submitted, not only are the claims, as amended, and the new claims, not anticipated under Section 102 of the patent statute. The claims also define unobvious invention under Section 103, because the relationships defined in the claims, and the motivating thought behind them, are not fairly suggested by the references of record.

Any suggestion that Ingemann et al. fairly teaches the invention as now claimed would be to use impermissible hindsight to reconstruct the reference in an un-suggested way that would lose the functionality that the reference aimed to provide!

Accordingly, early favorable action is solicited.

Enclosed is a check in the amount of \$86.00 for excess claim fees and a check in the amount of \$475.00 for the Petition for Three-Month Extension of Time fee.

Applicant : Jeffrey T. Mannion et al.  
Serial No. : 10/052,210  
Filed : January 16, 2002  
Page : 21 of 21

Attorney Docket No.: 11578-006001

Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing  
Attorney Docket No. 11578-006001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

June 10, 2004

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
225 Franklin Street  
Boston, MA 02110-2804  
Telephone: (617) 542-5070  
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

20876959.doc

John N. Williams  
Reg. No. 18,948